

AMENDMENT TO RULES COMMITTEE PRINT 115-

23

OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 104, after line 6, insert the following:

1 **SEC. 337. COMPTROLLER GENERAL REVIEW OF DEPART-**
2 **MENT OF DEFENSE COST MODELS USED IN**
3 **MAKING PERSONNEL DECISIONS.**

4 The Comptroller General of the United States shall
5 review Department of Defense cost models used in making
6 personnel decisions. In carrying out such review, the
7 Comptroller General shall review a random sampling of
8 personnel decisions or convert the performance of func-
9 tions from performance by members of the Armed Forces,
10 Department of Defense employees, or contractor personnel
11 to see if savings were projected and realized. The review
12 shall include each of the following:

13 (1) An assessment of the extent to which the
14 Department uses cost comparison models in per-
15 sonnel decisions or in compliance with section 129a
16 of title 10, United States Code.

17 (2) An assessment of any cost analysis models
18 used, including but not limited to DODI 7041.04
19 and Office of Management and Budget Circular A-

1 76, and how such models are incorporated into
2 budgeting, appropriations, strategic planning, and
3 personnel processes.

4 (3) An assessment of whether the Department's
5 cost analysis models adequately incorporate the costs
6 for facilities, equipment, support, overhead, pension
7 compensation, and other benefits or administrative
8 costs.

9 (4) An assessment of any costs not reflected or
10 inaccuracies in the Department's cost analysis mod-
11 els, including a review of the factors designated and
12 whether they accurately reflect all life-cycle per-
13 sonnel costs, including costs associated with employ-
14 ment/contract length, labor rates, labor hours, and
15 cost increases.

16 (5) An assessment of post-analysis projected
17 costs compared with actual costs of work being per-
18 formed by members of the Armed Forces, Depart-
19 ment of Defense employees, or contractor personnel
20 to determine in saving or increases resulted.

21 (6) An assessment of the frequency and jus-
22 tifications for selecting a more costly workforce after
23 a cost analysis was performed.

24 (7) An assessment of the frequency and jus-
25 tifications for converting all or a portion of functions

1 from performance by members of the Armed Forces,
2 civilian, or contractor personnel to performance by
3 another workforce category.

4 (8) Recommendations for how cost analysis
5 models might be updated and applied to ensure ac-
6 curate life-cycle projected costs, including fully bur-
7 dened costs and all overhead and administration
8 costs, resulted in actual savings or performance by
9 the most appropriate workforce.

